



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,506	10/23/2001	Manoel Tenorio	020431.0934	3207

5073 7590 02/26/2004

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

LU, KUEN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/001,506

Applicant(s)

TENORIO, MANOEL

Examiner

Kuen S Lu

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/23/2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4. Lu 3/22/2004
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0050958 A1, hereafter "Keller") and further in view of Mandler et al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0049675 A1, hereafter "Mandler").

As per Claims 1, 12 and 20, Keller teaches the following:

"an electronic commerce system for the reuse of transaction documents" at Page 1, [0004] by describing an on-line facility for providing customer with supplier information about transaction status involving products of the supplier;

"one or more document repositories operable to store a plurality of transactions documents" at Page 4, [0049] by using the transaction log table as the repository of all transaction documents; and

"an intelligence module operable to create one or more generic documents from one or more transaction documents" at Page 5, [0052] by creating XML document from the steps of receiving message, converting data into XML format, concatenating message envelope and resulting an XML formatted payload transaction document.

Keller does not specifically teach global content directory containing a plurality of classes in a hierarchy or search engine for querying transaction documents.

However, Mandler teaches "a global content directory including a plurality of classes organized in a hierarchy" at Fig. 6, element 96 and Fig. 9, elements 112, 122 and 124, and Page 6, [0089] by showing the content directory consisting of sub-directories in a hierarchical structure, "each class categorizing the transaction documents and associated with one or more attributes of the transaction documents categorized in the class" at least one of the classes having one or more associated pointers that identify one or more document repositories" at Fig. 9, elements 112, 122, 124, 130 and 132 by showing the file folders serving as content classes for different attributes pointing to the XML files.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Mandler's reference into Keller's by implementing the transaction documents into a hierarchical structure in file folder format because by doing so the transactions of documents would have been more direct and efficient since it would have eliminated the process of storing the transaction documents into database and bypassed the use of sql query for retrieving business transactions.

Mandler further teaches "a search interface operable to communicate a search query for the transaction documents to one or more document repositories identified by pointers associated with one or more of the classes" at Fig. 5A where step 66 serves as the search module.

As per Claims 2, 13 and 21, Keller teaches "the transaction documents comprise third party documents" at Page 5, [0052] by referring to the manufacturer's EDI specific formatted documents.

As per Claims 3, 14 and 22, Mandler further teaches "the classes comprise a plurality of document classes" at Fig. 8, elements 112, 120 and 122 by showing the file folders consisting of sub-folders serving as the classes consisting of sub-classes.

As for Claims 4, 15 and 23, Keller teaches "the classes comprise a plurality of product classes" at Fig. 30, elements 402 and 410 by showing the one to many relationship between classes of manufacturers and home pages.

As per Claims 6, Mandler further teaches "search interface is further operable to allow a user to navigate through the classes to search for a particular transaction document" at Fig. 9, element 132 and Page 6, [0093], lines 1-6 by browsing the document at the bottom of the hierarchical tree.

As per Claims 7, 18 and 26, Mandler further teaches "the intelligence module is further operable to dynamically adjust the information in the sections in the generic documents to include current information" at Page 7, [0093] by providing feature for timely updated (to current need) and organized document to the user.

As per Claim 8, Mandler further teaches "search interface is further operable to allow a user to view the generic documents" at Fig. 9, element 132, and Page 6, [0093], lines 1-6 by browsing the document at the bottom of the hierarchical tree.

As per Claims 9, 17 and 25, Keller teaches "a security module associated with the global content directory, the security module operable to encrypt the transaction

documents to control user access to the documents” at Page 2, [0015] by manufacturer to download its transaction documents, partition the file and protect it by security techniques so that the protected sections will not be disclosed to other unauthorized manufacturers.

As per Claim 10, Keller teaches “the documents comprise one or more standard documents stored in a shared document repository” at Page 4, [0049] by storing all transaction documents into the log table within a manufacturer’s database.

As per Claim 11, Keller teaches “the documents comprise one or more unique documents stored in one or more seller databases” at Page 1, [0001] by an application of supplier/reseller interaction for conducting EDI executing and reporting to their internal database with transaction documents stored in the log table at Page 2, [0049].

As per Claims 19 and 27, Keller teaches “selecting a transaction document from the transaction documents located using the search interface” at Page 4, [0049] by storing all transaction documents into the log table within a manufacturer’s database;

Keller does not specifically teach viewing the generic document, though Keller does teach viewing the transaction documents.

However, Mandler teaches “viewing the generic document created from the transaction document” at at Fig. 9, element 132, and Page 6, [0093], lines 1-6 by browsing the document at the bottom of the hierarchical tree.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant’s invention was made to combine Mandler’s reference into Keller’s by extending the browser functionality to cover both generic and transaction documents

because by doing so it would be facilitated for modifying business transaction pages with the information from generic documents.

Mandler further teaches "completing the generic document with a plurality of user specific information" at Page 7, [0093] by providing feature for timely updated (to current need) and organized document to the user.

3. Claims 5, 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0050958 A1, hereafter "Keller") and in view of Mandler et al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0049675 A1, hereafter "Mandler"), as applied to Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-23 and 25-27, and further in view of Schumacher et al. (U.S. Patent 6,442,574, hereafter "Schumacher").

As per Claims 5, 16 and 24, the references of Keller and Mandler together teach electronic commerce system comprising of transaction documents structured into hierarchy classes of classes (the Abstract).

Both Keller and Mandler do not specifically teach an intelligence module to perform transaction document segmenting and reorganizing.

However, Schmacher teaches the following:

"segments the transaction documents into one or more sections" at Fig. 6, elements 162 and 164 by browser to retrieve document and associated map file for reference;
"determines which sections of the transaction documents are generic and which sections are specific to a particular transaction" and "removes from the transaction document; information in the sections specific to a particular transaction" at Fig. 6,

elements 168-172 by ensuring the match of element names in SGML instance and DTD with those in the map file.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Mandle and Shumacher's references with Keller's by using structured document browser to segment and regroup transaction document into new document because by doing so the large transaction document could be sectioned into small sections and linked together for easier to edit and better to control.

Keller teaches "carrying forward the generic sections from the transaction documents into the generic documents to protect one or more confidential details in the transaction documents" at Page 2, [0015] by manufacturer to download its transaction documents, partition the file and protect it by security techniques so that the protected sections will not be disclosed to other unauthorized manufacturers.

Conclusions

4. The prior art made of record
 - A. U.S. Publication 2003/0050958
 - B. U.S. Publication 2001/0049675
 - C. U.S. Patent 6,442,574

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- D. U.S. Patent 6,560,620
- E. U.S. Patent 6,397,231

F. U.S. Patent	6,226,675
G. U.S. Patent	6,092,121
H. U.S. Patent	5,812,995

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 703-305-4894. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

KL

Patent Examiner

February 19, 2004

Kuen S. Lu 3/22/2004
(All IDS initialized)

John E. Breene
JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100